

Advancing laparoscopic surgery with the use of augmented reality headsets

Adithya Baskar¹, Joseph Moryousef², Michael Uy², Braden Millan²,
Edward D. Matsumoto², Yanbo Guo²

¹Michael G. DeGroote School of Medicine, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada; ²Department of Surgery, Division of Urology, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada

Cite as: Baskar A, Moryousef J, Uy M, et al. Advancing laparoscopic surgery with the use of augmented reality headsets. *Can Urol Assoc J* 2026;20(11):E423-8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5489/cuaj.9583>

Published online July 20, 2026

ABSTRACT

INTRODUCTION: Laparoscopic surgery faces ergonomic and visualization challenges. While robotic surgery addresses these challenges, it is often limited by cost. AR headset technology can offer a readily implementable complement to laparoscopic surgery at a lower cost. We aimed to evaluate the potential utility of implementing augmented reality (AR) glasses as an alternative to traditional laparoscopic display screens.

METHODS: A within-subjects crossover study was conducted, including 34 participants consisting of urology residents, fellows, and staff. Participants completed either a circle cutting exercise in a laparoscopic box simulator (n=19) or a procedural step during a live porcine nephrectomy (n=15), using both the traditional laparoscopic display and AR glasses. Participants completed a questionnaire assessing the AR glasses in image quality, ergonomics, task performance, and overall experience.

RESULTS: The majority of ratings favored AR glasses over traditional monitors for image quality, ergonomics, and performance. Most participants favored AR glasses over traditional monitors, with 85.8% favoring AR for image quality ($p<0.001$), 84.8% for ergonomics ($p<0.001$), 90.1% for performance ($p<0.001$), and 90.1% for overall experience ($p<0.001$).

CONCLUSIONS: AR glasses are a feasible alternative to traditional laparoscopic displays, providing the benefits of improved ergonomics and visualization during laparoscopic surgery, while benefiting from substantially lower costs in comparison to robotic systems. These advantages and high overall participant satisfaction suggest that AR technology could serve a role in complementing and enhancing laparoscopic surgery. Validation in a real-world setting is imperative to corroborate these findings.

INTRODUCTION

Augmented reality (AR) is a rapidly evolving technology that can be readily integrated into a surgical setting by overlaying digital information/preoperative imaging into the surgeon's field of view.¹⁻³ With the advent of wearable AR technology, such as headsets, AR has been able to be integrated into surgical contexts, where it has enhanced intraoperative navigation and depth perception through improved three-dimensional (3D) visualization;⁴⁻⁶ however, despite the growing literature surrounding various potential clinical applications, its integration into clinical practice remains in its early stages.^{7,8}

Laparoscopic surgery is a well-established, minimally invasive surgical approach that is routinely used globally across surgical specialties.⁹ Traditional visual displays, typically consisting of external monitor screens connected to the laparoscopic camera apparatus, are critical for safety and efficiency, but often suffer from limitations, including suboptimal positioning, poor image quality, and high costs.¹⁰ Robotic surgery addresses many of these limitations by providing improved surgeon ergonomics, as well as 3D visualization capabilities;¹¹ however, the cost of robotic platforms can be substantial, limiting their adoption in many resource-limited healthcare settings.¹²

AR glasses present an opportunity to complement laparoscopic surgery by providing some of the ergonomic benefits and 3D visualization capabilities of robotic platforms at a fraction of the cost; however, despite the potential benefits, the current body of literature on the use of AR glasses in laparoscopic surgery

is lacking, perhaps due in part to surgeon unfamiliarity and perceived limitations of image quality and task performance.

The XREAL Air 2 glasses are a lightweight, inexpensive, commercially available set of AR glasses with on-demand adjustable electrochromic dimming for optimal surgical visibility. The current study aimed to investigate the effectiveness of these AR glasses in a bench-top laparoscopic trainer and a live porcine animal model. The goal was to determine if AR headsets can provide a practical, efficient, and cost-effective alternative to traditional displays in the operating room.

METHODS

Study design and participants

This was a within-subjects crossover study that was conducted at a single center (McMaster University, Hamilton, ON). Data was collected during urology resident laparoscopic surgery courses at the McMaster Centre for Minimal Access Surgery (CMAS) on two separate occasions in September and October 2024. Participants included urologists at various career stages, including residents, fellows, and staff attending the course. Enrolment was voluntary, and there was no remuneration or incentive for participation. Participants were assigned to a station based on availability in a non-random allocation. This study was in compliance with the institutional research board (AUP-23-72).

The technologies compared in the study included a traditional Stryker 30-inch laparoscopic monitor display and XREAL Air 2 Ultra AR glasses. This device was selected over other commercially available AR headsets due to its affordability, light weight, and easy integration into standard laparoscopic setups. These glasses weigh 82 g and currently cost \$700 CAD per unit.¹³ The AR glasses were connected to existing laparoscopic systems

in the operating room via a standard HDMI cable to the Stryker Connected OR Hub¹⁴ with the XREAL Beam adapter (Figure 1).¹⁵ The quick setup allowed the AR glasses to mirror the 2D laparoscopic feed with minimal setup time and no additional software or equipment. The setup maintained the functionality of existing laparoscopic monitors, allowing concurrent visualization on traditional monitors, if required.

The first station involved a laparoscopic box simulator circle cutting task, in which participants used laparoscopic scissors and a grasper to cut out a circle from a piece of cloth along a predrawn outline. This simulation was connected to both the laparoscopic monitor display and the AR glasses. Participants were instructed to perform the exercise twice, once using the laparoscopic monitor and once using the AR glasses; the order of the arms was alternated for each participant. Each participant was given five minutes to complete each exercise.

The second station involved a live porcine nephrectomy model during which participating urologists performed various parts of the procedure. Participants were given opportunities to use both technologies, each for a step of the nephrectomy, enabling assessment of AR visualization in a dynamic surgical environment. The exact step of the nephrectomy was not consistent across participants, given the limited number of porcine models available.

Outcomes

A predetermined survey was created by two surgeons (EM, YG). All study participants were given the survey following completion of the study exercises. The primary outcome was the overall experience of the AR goggle display compared to the traditional laparoscopic display. The questionnaire collected basic demographic information and included multiple items across three primary surgical domains: ergonomics, image quality, and task performance. Responses were recorded using a modified five-point Likert scale, ranging from “strongly favors laparoscopic monitor” to “strongly favors AR glasses” and “no preference” as the three-point mark. Additionally, there were open-ended sections to allow general feedback and personal insights on the potential advantages and/or limitations of AR glasses in laparoscopic surgery. The questionnaire can be found at: *AR Survey Final.pdf* - Google Drive.

Data analysis

Responses were categorized into three groups for each questionnaire item: “prefer AR” (combining “strongly favors AR glasses” and “favors AR glasses”); “no prefer-




Figure 1. (A) XREAL Air 2 Ultra AR glasses. (B) Laparoscopic simulation setup with Stryker 30-inch laparoscopic monitor.

ence,” and “prefer traditional” (combining “favors laparoscopic monitor” and “strongly favors laparoscopic monitor”). For each domain of ergonomics, image quality, and task performance, composite scores were calculated by aggregating responses across all items within that domain.

To evaluate overall preference for AR glasses vs. traditional laparoscopic monitors, neutral ratings were excluded, and McNemar’s test was performed within each domain to compare the proportion of participants preferring AR to those preferring traditional monitors. Chi-squared tests were conducted to assess differences in preference distributions between participants with and without baseline corrective vision, and between those who participated in the box simulator model vs. the live porcine model.

Qualitative responses from open-ended questions were analyzed to identify recurring feedback patterns in order to summarize the benefits and challenges associated with the AR-assisted laparoscopic workflow.

RESULTS

Cohort overview

A total of 34 participants were enrolled in the study, including 26 residents (76.5%), four fellows (11.8%), and four attending surgeons (11.8%). The mean age was 32.2 ± 9.6 years. Of the participants, 25 (73.5%) had no prior experience with AR systems, while eight (23.5%) reported minimal previous experience and one (2.9%) reported moderate previous experience. There were 14 (41.2%) participants who wore corrective lenses, whereas the remaining 20 (58.8%) did not (Table 1). Of the participants, 19 (55.9%) participated in the box simulator model and 15 (44.1%) in the live porcine model.

Table 1. Demographic data of participants testing augmented reality glasses in laparoscopic simulations

Demographic	Value
Age, mean (SD)	32.2 (± 9.6)
Position, n=34 (%)	
Resident	26 (76.5)
Fellow	4 (11.8)
Staff	4 (11.8)
Previous AR experience, n=34 (%)	
None	25 (73.5)
Minimal	8 (23.5)
Moderate	1 (2.9)
Application type, n=34 (%)	
Box simulator	19 (55.9)
Live porcine model	15 (44.1)
Baseline corrective vision, n=34 (%)	
Yes	14 (41.2)
No	20 (58.8)

SD: standard deviation.

Preferences for display type

AR glasses were consistently preferred over traditional laparoscopic monitors across all domains in both the box simulator and live porcine nephrectomy groups (Figure 2). Preference patterns were largely comparable, with similar ratings across all domains.

When both groups were combined and neutral responses were excluded, AR glasses were consistently




Figure 2. Preferences for augmented reality vs. traditional monitors between laparoscopic simulation and live porcine nephrectomy groups.

preferred across all domains, with 85.8% preferring the AR glasses over the traditional monitor for image quality ($p<0.001$), 84.8% for ergonomics ($p<0.001$), 90.1% for task performance, and 90.1% for overall experience ($p<0.001$) (Figure 3).

Preferences were compared between participants who required corrective lenses and those who did not. Participants who did not require corrective lenses preferred AR glasses in the domains of image quality ($p<0.001$), ergonomics ($p=0.03$), and performance ($p<0.001$); however, there was no significant difference in overall evaluation between the two groups (Figure 4).

Final perception

The overall impressions of AR glasses were positive, with 88.2% of participants indicating a favorable experience using AR glasses, 82.4% reporting benefits in display size, and 92.2% reporting improved ergonomics. A subset of participants (17.6%) felt that the AR glasses could interfere with certain aspects of surgery. Overall,

82.4% of participants expressed interest in using AR in clinical practice (Table 2).

Qualitative feedback

In total, seven (20.1%) participants offered additional qualitative feedback. Thematic analysis of the feedback revealed participants enjoyed the increased comfort and overall improvement of ergonomics provided by the AR glasses, with one participant expressing that the AR glasses were "...more comfortable, dynamic, and focused."

Areas of concern identified included potential logistical limitations during the open aspects of the procedure (e.g., port placement, specimen extraction, closure), as well as lens fogging intraoperatively. A suggestion for future improvement was to expand the visual field by using larger lenses in the AR glasses.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study show an overall positive reaction to the use of AR glasses in a laparoscopic simula-




Figure 3. Proportion of non-neutral participant ratings that preferred augmented reality glasses over traditional laparoscopic monitors. AR: augmented reality.




Figure 4. Preferences for augmented reality (AR) vs. traditional monitors based on corrective vision status.

tion setting by participating urologists and trainees. In total, 91.1% of participants preferred AR glasses over the traditional laparoscopic monitor, with preference for AR glasses consistent throughout all domains evaluated—image quality, ergonomics, and task performance. Furthermore, the final impressions of the AR glasses were favorable overall, with 82.4% of participants indicating they would be interested in using AR glasses in clinical practice. These results suggest that AR glasses have a potential complementary role for adoption as a technological adjunct in laparoscopic approaches.

A key advantage AR glasses provide over traditional laparoscopic monitors is the improvement in surgeon ergonomics. We found that 84.8% of participants found AR glasses more ergonomic than traditional laparoscopic monitors. The ergonomics were frequently commented on in the qualitative feedback portion of the survey, as participants reported the AR glasses were comfortable, light, and easy to handle. Unlike fixed monitors that require surgeons to maintain static neck positioning, AR glasses allow dynamic positioning and a more natural head positioning, improving posture and reducing neck strain.

Ergonomics has been a longstanding issue with laparoscopy, given the procedure causes musculoskeletal strain for surgeons due to prolonged fixed positions with repetitive movements.¹⁶ A workload study assessing the impact of surgical modality on surgeon wellness demonstrated that laparoscopic surgery is associated with high levels of physical demand, postoperative surgeon discomfort, and risk of developing neuromusculoskeletal disorders.¹⁷ In a similar study, the use of AR headsets in video-assisted surgeries reported that headset use resulted in improved scores on a muscular workload questionnaire, indicating lower physical strain when compared to traditional monitors.¹⁸

The AR glasses evaluated in this study also had on-demand adjustable electrochromic dimming, allowing users to adjust screen transparency so it can be readily transitioned to clear for open portions of the procedure (e.g., port placement, specimen extraction). Collectively, this evidence suggests AR glasses provide meaningful ergonomic benefits that contribute to improved surgeon comfort in laparoscopic settings.

Image quality and task performance using AR glasses were important metrics to evaluate. Participants reported 85.8% and 90.1% preference for AR glasses in image quality and task performance, respectively. A study assessing the feasibility of AR head-mounted devices (HMDs) in orthopedic surgery corroborates our findings, as they showed surgeons were generally satisfied with image quality and accuracy when using

Table 2. Final perception ratings on use of AR glasses in laparoscopic surgery

Final perception	n=34	Percentage (%)
Liked AR	30	88.2
Sees benefit in usage	20	58.8
Benefits in display size	28	82.4
Improved ergonomics	31	92.2
AR glasses interfered with surgery	6	17.6
Interested in using in clinical practice	28	82.4

AR: augmented reality.

AR HMDs.¹⁹

There are still mixed opinions on AR implementation in surgical settings, as other reports identified concerns, including suboptimal image quality and latency compared to standard monitors.^{19,20} Similarly, evidence surrounding task performance remains inconclusive, as some reports suggest AR use increases the risk of surgical errors.^{7,21,22} These varying findings likely reflect differences in AR headset models, quality, and technical configurations, as well as the heterogeneity in the products available in the market.

Robotic-assisted surgery has recently increased in popularity;¹¹ however, the widespread adoption of robotic-assisted surgery is often limited due to the significant expenses involved, costing well over \$1 000 000 USD for initial investments, as well as ongoing maintenance costs.¹² AR headsets can provide a more affordable and accessible alternative to enhance laparoscopic procedures, with some of the benefits of robotics but without the significant financial burden of robotic equipment.

The AR glasses used in this study were priced at \$700 CAD per unit, a fraction of the cost of new laparoscopic monitors and robotic systems.¹³ The AR glasses were also easy to integrate into existing laparoscopic setups, requiring minimal hardware and no additional software. The affordability and easy integration of AR glasses into laparoscopic operating rooms makes them an attractive alternative in resource-limited settings.

Limitations

There are limitations to the use of AR goggles and to our study of them.

First, surgeons who require corrective vision may be hindered by AR goggles. Our analysis revealed that participants who required corrective lenses were less likely to

prefer AR glasses. These experiences likely vary by device, with different headsets offering various levels of accommodation for corrective vision. The AR glasses used in this study (i.e., XREAL Air 2 Ultra) have the option of a prescription lens attachment but this was not implemented in our study. Despite the lower ratings, the majority of participants requiring corrective lenses still reported an overall positive impression of AR glasses (72%).

Second, AR glasses may interfere with certain operative steps that require access to the surgical field, such as trocar placement and specimen extraction. Although the AR glasses have transparent lenses for when no images are being displayed, visualization may be suboptimal compared to usual practice. In addition, it is important to note that ideally, all operating team members, including assistants and scrub nurses, use their own pair of AR glasses; however, this is not absolutely necessary. Standard 2D displays that most operating rooms carry can be used simultaneously while the primary surgeon(s) use the AR glasses.

Third, only one AR headset model was evaluated. Varying models will inevitably introduce differences in image quality, latency, depth perception, weight, and ergonomics. Additionally, outcomes were assessed through subjective questionnaire ratings rather than objective performance measures. While subjective impressions are crucial in determining the potential for adoption of a new tool, objective measures of accuracy, task completion time, and error rates are key in providing quality and safety data.

Lastly, our evaluation time was short (i.e., five minutes) and inconsistent for the specific steps performed, which introduces variability in user experience and thus impacts perceptions.

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, our study shows that AR glasses were rated favorably compared to traditional laparoscopic display monitors among urologists across training stages. AR glasses were favorable in image quality, ergonomics, task performance, and overall experience. AR glasses represent an attractive, affordable adjunct technology to enhance laparoscopic procedures compared to traditional monitors. Validation in a real-world setting is imperative to corroborate these findings.

This paper has been peer reviewed.

COMPETING INTERESTS: The authors have no relevant conflicts of interest to report.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: The authors would like to acknowledge the McMaster Centre for Minimal Access Surgery for allowing us to conduct this study during their training sessions.

REFERENCES

- Shuhaiber JH. Augmented reality in surgery. *Arch Surg* 2004;139:170-4. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archsurg.139.2.170>
- Vávra P, Roman J, Zonča P, et al. Recent development of augmented reality in surgery: A review. *J Healthc Eng* 2017;2017:4574172. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/4574172>
- Millan B, Pramod N, Saini J, et al. Augmented reality assisted MRI/US fusion for non-rectal fully trans-perineal prostate biopsy. *Urol Case Rep* 2025;62:103159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eur.2025.103159>
- Bianchi L, Chessa F, Angiolini A, et al. The use of augmented reality to guide the intraoperative frozen section during robot-assisted radical prostatectomy. *Eur Urol* 2021;80:480-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2021.06.020>
- Ding H, Sun W, Zheng G. Robot-assisted augmented reality (AR)-guided surgical navigation for periacetabular osteotomy. *Sensors (Basel)* 2024;24:4754. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s24144754>
- Chen Z, Cruciani L, Fan K, et al. Towards safer robot-assisted surgery: A markerless augmented reality framework. *Neural Netw* 2024;178:106469. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2024.106469>
- Ramalhinho J, Yoo S, Dowrick T, et al. The value of augmented reality in surgery - A usability study on laparoscopic liver surgery. *Med Image Anal* 2023;90:102943. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.media.2023.102943>
- Ma L, Huang T, Wang J, et al. Visualization, registration and tracking techniques for augmented reality guided surgery: A review. *Phys Med Biol* 2023;68. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6560/acc23>
- Lee WJ, Chan CP, Wang BY. Recent advances in laparoscopic surgery. *Asian J Endosc Surg* 2013;6:1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ases.12001>
- Hazrah P, Sharma D, Anand G, et al. Ergonomics in laparoscopic surgery: An appraisal of evidence. In: Sharma D, Hazrah P, eds. *Recent Concepts in Minimal Access Surgery: Volume 1*. Springer; 2022:193-218. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-5473-2_8
- Chucholo A, Ali A. Is robotic-assisted surgery better? *AMA J Ethics* 2023;25:E598-604. <https://doi.org/10.1001/amajethics.2023.598>
- Feldstein J, Schwander B, Roberts M, et al. Cost of ownership assessment for a da Vinci robot based on US real-world data. *Int J Med Robot* 2019;15:e2023. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rcs.2023>
- XREAL. XREAL Air 2 Ultra AR glasses. Available at: <https://www.xreal.com> (accessed May 28, 2026)
- Stryker. Stryker Connected OR Hub. Available at: <https://www.stryker.com> (accessed May 28, 2026)
- XREAL. XREAL Beam Adapter. Available at: <https://www.xreal.com> (accessed May 28, 2026)
- Manfred S, Athanasiadis DI, Umana L, et al. A comparison of laparoscopic and robotic ergonomic risk. *Surg Endosc* 2022;36:8397-402. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-022-09105-0>
- Norasi H, Hallbeck MS, Elli EF, et al. Impact of preferred surgical modality on surgeon wellness: A survey of workload, physical pain/discomfort, and neuromusculoskeletal disorders. *Surg Endosc* 2023;37:9244-54. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-023-10485-0>
- Lim AK, Ryu J, Yoon HM, et al. Ergonomic effects of medical augmented reality glasses in video-assisted surgery. *Surg Endosc* 2022;36:988-98. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-021-08363-8>
- Dennler C, Bauer DE, Scheibler AG, et al. Augmented reality in the operating room: A clinical feasibility study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2021;22:451. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12891-021-04339-w>
- Falola RA, Lombana NF, Rodriguez-Unda NA, et al. Augmented reality microsurgery: Proof of concept for a novel approach to microsurgical field visualization in plastic surgery. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2024;153:650e. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.00000000000010705>
- Badioli G, Ferrai V, Cutolo F, et al. Augmented reality as an aid in maxillofacial surgery: Validation of a wearable system allowing maxillary repositioning. *J Craniomaxillofac Surg* 2014;42:1970-6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcms.2014.09.001>
- Dixon BJ, Daly MJ, Chan H, et al. Surgeons blinded by enhanced navigation: The effect of augmented reality on attention. *Surg Endosc* 2013;27:454-61. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-012-2457-3>

CORRESPONDENCE: Dr. Yanbo Guo, Department of Surgery, Division of Urology, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada; yanbo.guo@medportal.ca